arXiv:1205.6658v2 [cs.CC] 20 Aug 2012

From classical versus quantum algorithms to P versus NP

Michel Feldmann *

Abstract

What is the powerful ingredient which allows a dramatic speed-up of quantum computation over classical computation ? We propose that this ingredient is an implicit use of the Bayesian probability theory. Furthermore, we argue that both classical and quantum computation are special cases of probability reasoning. On these grounds, introducing Bayesian probability theory in classical computation as well, we reduce a typical NP problem, namely 3-SAT, to a linear programming problem. According to algorithmic complexity theory, this proves that P=NP.

1 Introduction

Computation of a deterministic function is fundamentally a conclusive process. Therefore, the insertion of randomness in algorithms should be regarded as counterproductive. By contrast, Leonid Levin, an outstanding former student of Kolmogorov claims on his home page [1] that randomness is really 'native' to Computer Science. In the present paper, we strongly support this claim and argue that this is basically the consequence of the profound identity between logic and probability as stated in Bayesian theory, even if this direction may not be exactly in line with the Kolmogorov views. To reach our goal, we deal at the intersection of several fields: Algorithmic computation, algorithmic complexity, quantum computation and of course Bayes probability. In each domain, we pick out a very few ingredients, often at the simplest elementary level. Together, these ingredients lead surprisingly to a straightforward but exceptional achievement: Any logical algorithm can be formulated as a linear programming problem. Specially, a basic question of logical satisfiability with n variables, namely 3-SAT, is equivalent to a linear programming problem with $\mathrm{O}(n^3)$ unknowns and even in general with $\mathrm{O}(n)$ unknowns. According to algorithmic complexity theory, this proves that P=NP.

This paper is organized as follows: We shortly skate over the foundation of the domains of interest through an historical sketch placing emphasis on the implicated ingredients. Next, we describe how to specify logical algorithms in terms of conditional probability. We finally apply this model to the 3-SAT problem before concluding.

2 Hints on the different domains

2.1 Foundation of algorithmic computation

The concept of algorithm as a process of effective calculability was formulated independently by Alonzo Church [2] and Alan Turing [3] in 1936. In the modern formulation, the so-called *Church-Turing principle*, states that any algorithm can be performed with a 'deterministic Turing machine'.

---

*Electronic address: michel.feldmann@polytechnique.org

In the late 1950s, Michael Rabin [4] described a two tape automaton introducing the idea of *nondeterministic Turing machines* and suggesting the use of a new ingredient in computation, namely, randomness. In 1970, E. R. Berlekamp [5] described such an algorithm requiring a sequence of trials selected at random. Later, in 1977, Robert Solovay and Volker Strassen [6] found that the problem of integer primality, at this time out of reach of tractable deterministic algorithms, was settled by randomization. It should be noticed that the deep reason of this improbable efficiency remained basically unknown. Whatever that may be, the concept of Turing machine had to be extended to account for these results. Nowadays, the so-called *strong Church-Turing principle* postulates that any classical computation can be performed with 'a non deterministic Turing machine.' However, the insertion of randomness in classical algorithms consisted mainly in selecting input data at random. This remained pretty 'miserable' when compared with the next advance : quantum computation.

2.2 Quantum computation

Following ideas by Richard Feynman [7], David Deutsch discovered quantum computation in 1985 [8]. This process makes use of formidable quantum resources, but remains definitely a probabilistic algorithm. Compared to classical algorithms, the function to be computed is prepared in form of a physical setup of n-registers or regions. A standard assignment is inserted as a joint probability distribution over the regions. Physically, the joint probability distribution is derived from a wave function living in a Hilbert space, but for what we are concerned, only the probability distribution is of interest. Each region, called a qubit, is the quantum analogue of a classical bit. The final measurement is a random trial where each qubit *'collapses'* into a classical bit with a deterministic value, say 0 or 1. Generally, the qubit distributions are not independent and the regions are known as *entangled.* Otherwise, the qubit are called *separable.* A quantum algorithms is a physical setup, composed of suitable quantum gates and convenient settings which mimic logical functions [9]. In practice, quantum algorithms are described in form of circuits, where wires stand for qubits and gates are selected among a tool kit [10].

In some cases, this method was proven to extend the class of tractable problems and provided a substantial speed-up over classical algorithms [11]. Specially, Peter Shor [12] found in 1994 an efficient quantum process to factorize integers in polynomial time, while such an algorithm is still unknown in classical computation. According to Deutsch, 'the theory of computation' became 'the *quantum* theory of computation', even if we have to recognize that efficient quantum computers are not likely to be available in the foreseeable future.

Again, the main reasons of the supposedly quantum efficiency are basically unknown, but the common wisdom is that *entanglement* should be the key ingredient. Indeed, in the quantum community, it is 'widely believed that classical systems cannot simulate highly entangled quantum systems' [13]. By contrast, we have nevertheless argued [14] that the concept of entanglement is actually a quite *classical* attribute of contextual systems. Furthermore, any classical computer can be regarded as a highly entangled system as far as the entanglement is measured between the binary digits of the processed data during the computation. In addition, we shall argue that the crucial ingredient is not in the least a Hilbert space with its full quantum machinery but only a flexible randomization, or to be exact, the implicit use of Bayes probabilities. This is like a grin without a cat in Alice and Bob adventures in Quantum Land.

2.3 Bayes probability

In the probability domain, at least two conceptions have been widely debated [15]. According to the 'Frequentists', probability should be regarded as a real property of an object. By contrast, for the 'Bayesians', probability characterizes not the object but the level of knowledge of the observer on the object. The Bayesian conception was implicitly admitted by Bernouilli, Laplace or Poincaré. But at the beginning of the 20th century, the Frequentist view became more and more popular, possibly in accordance with the 'Copenhagen interpretation' of quantum mechanics. This interpretation states that quantum randomness is absolute, 'ontological', in opposition with Einstein views, convinced that 'God does not play dice'. But after World War II, the works of George Pólya [16], Richard Cox [17], Claude Shannon [18] and Edwin Jaynes [15] gave new supports to the Bayesian vision. Pólya demonstrated the strong connection between 'probability', 'plausibility', 'logic' and 'common sense'. Cox derived the actual mathematical structure of probability theory in accordance with both Pólya vision and Boolean operations. Eventually, Jaynes synthesised these results and conceived the maximum entropy principle, accounting for Shannon information theory. This gives its overall consistency to the Bayesian conception (which, in our opinion, should be rather called 'Jaynesian conception'). Now, as already formulated by Laplace, this theory is explicitly thought as an *extension of Aristotle logic* to situations where the knowledge of the observer is incomplete. Therefore, the mathematical tool for logic, namely Boole algebra, has to be extended to the algebra of events, namely a Kolmogorov probability space. In turn, we plead in the present paper that algorithmics, whether classical or quantum, has to be regarded as a special case of probability reasoning. But what about complexity?

2.4 Algorithmic complexity

It is well-known that logical algorithms may never terminate. This was the origin of the works of Turing [3] in 1936. Among the algorithms that halt, J. von Neumann [19] noticed in 1953, in the context of game theory, that some algorithms only terminate after an exponential time. In the sixties, appeared the need to establish a hierarchy to characterize the computation efficiency. The issue was first addressed by Rabin [20] in 1960 and precisely formulated by Alan Cobham [21], Juris Hartmanis & Richard Stearns [22] and Manual Blum [23] in 1964-1967. A basic class of complexity is the so-called class P of problems 'solvable by a deterministic algorithm within a number of steps bounded by some fixed polynomial in the length of the input' [24]. A typical class P problem is to check whether an explicit Boolean function is or not satisfied by a given assignment. Other important P problems are elementary arithmetic operations, solvability of linear systems, and noticeably, solvability of linear programming [25] (even if the most popular algorithm, the Dantzig simplex method [26], may be exponential in the worst case). This class is considered as the set of tractable problems.

By contrast, class NP, originally defined as the 'set of problems recognizable in polynomial time by a nondeterministic Turing machine', consists of problems for which a given solution can be *checked* in polynomial time. The classification of NP-problems is dominated by the discovery of NP-completeness. Informally, it is a subclass of NP such that any NP-algorithm can be reduced in polynomial time to an algorithm of this subclass. This concept was discovered by Stephen Cook in a seminal paper in 1971 [27] and independently by Leonid Levin [28] in 1973. Therefore, if one NP-complete algorithm is in P, then all NP-algorithms are in P which implies that $\mathsf{P} = \mathsf{NP}$. In 1972, Richard Karp [29] reviewed the mains algorithms in the different classes. Among NP-complete algorithms, we find satisfiability (or SAT) of a conjunction of clauses, [27] (an specially 3-SAT with exactly three literals per clause), 0-1 integer programming, or in graph theory, determination of cliques, set packing, Hamilton circuits, etc.

Now, an appealing bridge between P and NP algorithms is randomness. This is the object of the present paper.

3 Bayesian formulation of algorithms

For simplicity, we consider the Boolean algebra of n dichotomic variables X_i where $i \in [\![1,n]\!]$ with two possible assignments x_i and $\overline{x}_i$. Throughout this paper, depending upon the context, we will also use 1, TRUE or (i) for x_i, and 0, FALSE or $(-i)$ for $\overline{x}_i$. As in information theory [30], given decision functions f, f_1, f_2, it will be convenient to note $\overline{\mathsf{f}}$ the complement of f, $(\mathsf{f}_1;\mathsf{f}_2)$ the conjunction of f_1 and f_2 and $(\mathsf{f}_1,\mathsf{f}_2)$ the disjunction of f_1 and f_2. We will name *requirement* any literal (i.e. X_i or $\overline{\mathsf{X}}_i$) or conjunction of literals like $(\mathsf{X}_i;\overline{\mathsf{X}}_j;\dots;\mathsf{X}_k)$, *complete requirement* a requirement of n literals like $\Xi = (\mathsf{X}_1;\overline{\mathsf{X}}_2;\dots;\mathsf{X}_n)$ and *partial requirement* a requirement with less than n literals. Similarly, when needed, we will use the terms of *partial assignments*, e.g. $(i;-j;\dots;k)$, and *complete assignments*, e.g. $(1;-2;\dots;n)$.

In algorithmics, a literal is considered as a deterministic function and its assignment as a deterministic constant.

By contrast, we propose to regard literals X_i (or $\overline{\mathsf{X}}_i$ as well) as *random variables*, with two possible outcomes 0 and 1. Therefore requirements and more generally decision functions are ipso facto random variables, while assignments are still deterministic constants.

Now, an *event* is a decision function and the *outcomes* are the possible assignments, e.g., $\mathsf{X}_i = x_i$ or $\mathsf{f} = 1$. The basic sample set of probability is the ensemble $\Omega = \{\Xi\}$ of cardinality 2^n of all *complete requirements* Ξ, labeled by all *complete assignments* $\xi = (\pm 1;\pm 2;\dots;\pm n)$. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be the sigma-algebra over Ω and P a probability distribution on $\mathcal{T}$. The Kolmogorov probability space is now $(\Omega,\mathcal{T},\mathrm{P})$. Clearly, the sigma-algebra $\mathcal{T}$ of cardinality 2^{2^n} can be identified with the set of all classical decision functions of n variables.

In Bayesian theory, the probability distribution, P, is conditional and depends upon prior information. Since we are primary concerned by classical decision functions $\mathsf{f} \in \mathcal{T}$, we will compute probability distributions conditioned by the prior $\mathsf{f} =$ TRUE. Very occasionally, we will also consider wider conditions defined by specific equations not necessarily related to a classical decision function, for instance quantum conditions.

A decision function $\mathsf{f} \in \mathcal{T}$ is satisfiable if and only if $\mathsf{f} \neq \varnothing$. In terms of probability distribution, this means that the probabilities $\mathrm{P}(\xi|\mathsf{f})$ of all 2^n complete events of Ω, given that f is TRUE, sum to 1. By contrast, if $\mathsf{f} = \varnothing$, no conditional probability distribution $\mathrm{P}(\xi|\mathsf{f})$ can exist.

For $i, j, \dots \in [\![1,n]\!]$ we consider partial requirements given that f is TRUE, e.g, $(\mathsf{X}_i|\mathsf{f})$, $(\mathsf{X}_i;\overline{\mathsf{X}}_j|\mathsf{f})$, $(\overline{\mathsf{X}}_i;\mathsf{X}_j;\mathsf{X}_k|\mathsf{f})$, ..., $(\mathsf{X}_1;\mathsf{X}_2;\dots;\mathsf{X}_n|\mathsf{f})$. For simplicity, we have noted e.g., $(\mathsf{X}_i;\mathsf{X}_j|\mathsf{f})$ for $((\mathsf{X}_i;\mathsf{X}_j)|\mathsf{f})$, omitting some parenthesis. We will call *partial probabilities* the probabilities of partial requirements. Recall that we note $\mathrm{P}(\mathsf{X}_i = x_i|\mathsf{f})$ (and $\mathrm{P}(\overline{\mathsf{X}}_i = \overline{x}_i|\mathsf{f})$ as well) as $\mathrm{P}(i|\mathsf{f})$, $\mathrm{P}(\mathsf{X}_i = \overline{x}_i|\mathsf{f})$ (and $\mathrm{P}(\overline{\mathsf{X}}_i = x_i|\mathsf{f})$) as $\mathrm{P}(-i|\mathsf{f})$ and the probability of complete events $\mathrm{P}(\Xi = \xi|\mathsf{f})$ as $\mathrm{P}(\xi|\mathsf{f})$. Again we note $\mathrm{P}(i;j|\mathsf{f})$ for $\mathrm{P}((i;j)|\mathsf{f})$.

Irrespective of $\mathsf{f} \neq \varnothing$, by probability rules, partial probabilities conditioned by $\mathsf{f} =$ TRUE, obey the following *universal relations*:

$$\mathrm{P}(\pm i;\pm j;\pm k;\dots|\mathsf{f}) \geq 0 \tag{1}$$

$$1 = \mathrm{P}(i|\mathsf{f}) + \mathrm{P}(-i|\mathsf{f}) \tag{2}$$

$$\mathrm{P}(i|\mathsf{f}) = \mathrm{P}(i;j|\mathsf{f}) + \mathrm{P}(i;-j|\mathsf{f}) \tag{3}$$

$$\mathrm{P}(i;j|\mathsf{f}) = \mathrm{P}(i;j;k|\mathsf{f}) + \mathrm{P}(i;j;-k|\mathsf{f}) \tag{4}$$

etc., where $i, j, k, \dots$ are signed integers and $|i|, |j|, |k|, \dots \in [\![1,n]\!]$ are distinct. It is easy to establish that we have $\binom{n}{1} = n$ distinct equations like Eq.(2), $4\binom{n}{2}$ distinct equations like Eq.(3), $12\binom{n}{3}$ distinct equations like Eq.(4), etc. Note that accounting for Eqs.(2, 3, 4, etc.), Eq.(1) implies that

$$\mathrm{P}(\pm i;\pm j;\pm k;\dots|\mathsf{f}) \leq 1 \tag{5}$$

and

$$P(i|\mathsf{f}) = 0 \Rightarrow P(i;j|\mathsf{f}) = 0 \Rightarrow P(i;j;k|\mathsf{f}) = 0; \tag{6}$$

$$P(i;j;k|\mathsf{f}) = 1 \Rightarrow P(i;j|\mathsf{f}) = 1 \Rightarrow P(i|\mathsf{f}) = 1. \tag{7}$$

While the linear equations Eqs.(1, 2, 3, 4, etc.) express the rules of logic [17] and are therefore universal, a particular decision function f can be described by a number of *specific linear equations* between partial probabilities. For instance, in the next section, we will construct the specific linear equations of a 3-SAT problem (cf. Eq.(8) below). The *logical consistency* of the specific equations is precisely checked by reference to the universal equations. The system composed of the relevant universal relations and the specific equations define a classical *linear programming problem* [31], where the unknowns are the relevant partial probabilities. When feasible, each solution is a consistent probability distribution P over $\mathcal{T}$. The linear programming problem is characterized by a convex polytope of solutions in the linear vector space spanned by the ensemble of all relevant partial probabilities. We will refer to this object as the f*-polytope.* It is known that such a convex polytope is described by its extreme points (or vertices) [32]. A trivial case is the tautological function U, with no specific equation. We will name its polytope the U-polytope.

Separable events: Let e.g. $\Xi_0 \overset{(\mathrm{def})}{=} (\mathsf{X}_1;\ \overline{\mathsf{X}}_2;\ \ldots;\mathsf{X}_n)$ be a complete requirement and $\xi_0 \overset{(\mathrm{def})}{=} (x_1;\overline{x}_2;\ldots;x_n)$ the corresponding complete assignment, so that $\Xi_0 = \xi_0$ with certainty. We have by definition $P(x_1;\overline{x}_2;\ldots,x_n|\Xi_0) = 1$ and any partial probability like $P(x_i;x_j;\overline{x}_k|\Xi_0)$ is 0 or 1. These conditional events are also independent or '*separable*' (using quantum formulation). That is, e.g.,

$$P(i;j;-k|\Xi_0) = P(i|\Xi_0)\cdot P(j|\Xi_0)\cdot P(-k|\Xi_0)$$

In words, given a complete requirement, conditional partial probabilities are deterministic and separable. More generally, from the universal relations Eqs.(1, 2, 3, 4, etc.), a deterministic distribution, with all partial probabilities equal to 0 or 1, is separable, as stated by the following lemma:

Lemma 1. *Given a decision function* $\mathsf{f} \neq \varnothing$*, all deterministic solutions of the linear programming system are separable.*

Proof: By hypothesis, all partial probabilities are 0 or 1. We proceed by inspection. For example, for partial probabilities of three and less than three literals, let i, j, k be signed integers with distinct $|i|, |j|, |k| \in [\![1, n]\!]$. Consider e.g., the unknown $P(i;j;k|\mathsf{f})$. If at least one relevant unknown like $P(i|\mathsf{f})$ is zero then from Eq.(6) $P(i;j|\mathsf{f}) = 0$, i.e., $P(i;j|\mathsf{f}) = P(i|\mathsf{f})\cdot P(j|\mathsf{f})$ and $P(i;j;k|\mathsf{f}) = 0$, i.e., $P(i;j;k|\mathsf{f}) = P(i|\mathsf{f})\cdot P(j|\mathsf{f})\cdot P(k|\mathsf{f})$. Now, if $P(i|\mathsf{f}) = 1$, $P(j|\mathsf{f}) = 1$ and $P(k|\mathsf{f}) = 1$ then from Eq.(2) $P(-j|\mathsf{f}) = 0$, and from Eq.(6) $P(i;-j|\mathsf{f}) = 0$ and $P(i;j;-k|\mathsf{f}) = 0$. Therefore, from Eq.(3), $P(i;j|\mathsf{f}) = P(i|\mathsf{f}) = 1$, i.e., $P(i;j|\mathsf{f}) = P(i|\mathsf{f})\cdot P(j|\mathsf{f})$. Finally, from Eq.(4), $P(i;j;k|\mathsf{f}) = P(i;j|\mathsf{f}) = 1$, i.e., $P(i;j;k|\mathsf{f}) = P(i|\mathsf{f})\cdot P(j|\mathsf{f})\cdot P(k|\mathsf{f})$. We proceed similarly for more than three literals. The proof is completed.

Entangled events: Now, let Ξ_1 and Ξ_2 be two distinct complete requirements. We consider the disjunction $\mathsf{f} \overset{(\mathrm{def})}{=} (\Xi_1, \Xi_2)$. Let ξ_1, ξ_2 be the two complete assignments satisfying Ξ_1 and Ξ_2 respectively. Thus, given f, the probability $P(\xi|\mathsf{f})$ of any complete event is 0 except for $P(\xi_1|\mathsf{f})$ and $P(\xi_2|\mathsf{f})$. Therefore, f is described by the Bayesian linear programming system, limited to the complete probabilities $P(\xi|\mathsf{f})$,

$$\begin{aligned} &P(\xi_1|\mathsf{f}) + P(\xi_2|\mathsf{f}) = 1 \\ &\forall \xi \notin \{\xi_1, \xi_2\}:\ P(\xi|\mathsf{f}) = 0 \\ \text{subject to}\quad &\forall \xi:\ P(\xi|\mathsf{f}) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

The f-polytope is reduced to a line segment in the plane $(\mathrm{P}(\xi_1|\mathsf{f}), \mathrm{P}(\xi_2|\mathsf{f}))$. The extreme points of coordinates $(1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$ correspond to the two events $(\xi_1|\mathsf{f})$ and $(\xi_2|\mathsf{f})$. On the other hand, we may consider combinations of ξ_1 and ξ_2 within the edge $[\mathrm{P}(\xi_1|\mathsf{f}, \mathrm{P}(\xi_2|\mathsf{f})]$. Therefore, a number of non deterministic distributions are also solutions. For instance, in the middle of the edge, the two mutually exclusive events, $\Xi = \xi_1$ and $\Xi = \xi_2$ may be viewed as equally likely. In this case, partial probabilities, computed by enumerative combinatorics or simply by the probability product rule, read e.g. for three literals,

$$\mathrm{P}(i; j; k|\mathsf{f}) = \frac{1}{2}[\mathrm{P}(i; j; k|\Xi_1) + \mathrm{P}(i; j; k|\Xi_2)].$$

If the partial assignments (i), (j) and (k) are different in ξ_1 and ξ_2, we will describe events like $(i|\mathsf{f})$, $(i; j|\mathsf{f})$, $(i; j; k|\mathsf{f})$ etc., as '*entangled*', (using quantum formulation). This result can be extended to any logical combination of requirements. In summary, non deterministic partial probabilities are generally entangled.

Classical bit: Specially, consider a system with just a single variable. A one bit tautology $\mathsf{f} = \mathsf{U}$ is a satisfiable decision function described solely by the universal conditions Eqs.(1, 2), with two possible assignment (1) and (-1) and no specific equation. The linear programming problem reads

$$\begin{aligned} \text{universal equation}: &\quad \mathrm{P}(1|\mathsf{U}) + \mathrm{P}(-1|\mathsf{U}) = 1 \\ \text{subject to} &\quad \mathrm{P}(1|\mathsf{U}) \geq 0,\ \mathrm{P}(-1|\mathsf{U}) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

with two deterministic exclusive solutions, namely TRUE and FALSE, or (1) and (-1). The U-polytope of the classical bit is reduced to a one dimensional segment between the two points $(0, 1)$ and $(1, 0)$ in the plane $(\mathrm{P}(-1|\mathsf{U}), \mathrm{P}(1|\mathsf{U}))$.

Still with one variable, the specific equation, $\mathrm{P}(1|\mathsf{f}) = 0$ defines the function $\mathsf{f} = \overline{\mathsf{X}}_1$ while $\mathrm{P}(-1|\mathsf{f}) = 0$ describes the function $\mathsf{f} = \mathsf{X}_1$. The f-polytopes are both reduced to one isolated vertex. Theses functions are obviously 'classical' in the sense that they accept deterministic solutions. More generally, we will name *'classical' a linear programming problem that accepts deterministic solutions.*

Quantum bit: Linear programming is fully compatible with quantum information as well. However, a *strictly quantum* solution implicitly defined by a linear programming system cannot be deterministic, because before collapse, 'in the quantum world maximal information is not complete and cannot be completed' (quoting Caves et al [33]). This has to be stipulated by a specific equation. For instance, a qubit Q is defined by the system

$$\begin{aligned} \text{universal equation}: &\quad \mathrm{P}(1|\mathsf{Q}) + \mathrm{P}(-1|\mathsf{Q}) = 1 \\ \text{specific equation}: &\quad \mathrm{P}(1|\mathsf{Q}) = \mathrm{P}(-1|\mathsf{Q}) \\ \text{subject to} &\quad \mathrm{P}(1|\mathsf{Q}) \geq 0,\ \mathrm{P}(-1|\mathsf{Q}) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

In the classical world, this describes as well a one-bit system with incomplete information, e.g., a supposedly fair coin, given that it has *not* been tossed. The linear programming problem is still feasible but only accepts a single *non-deterministic solution.* The Q-polytope of the qubit is reduced to the isolated vertex, $\mathrm{P}(-1|\mathsf{Q}) = \mathrm{P}(1|\mathsf{Q}) = 1/2$. Therefore, no deterministic function is defined nor of course satisfiable. In other words, P, conditioned by Q is a solution of the linear programming problem but $\mathsf{Q} \notin \mathcal{T}$: Q is only defined by its specific equation.

Beyond the qubit, in quantum information or in classical systems with incomplete information, feasible solutions P of a linear programming problem are probability distributions conditioned by specific equations that does not necessarily refer to an element of $\mathcal{T}$. In a way, the set of specific equations defines an extension $\mathcal{Q}$ of the set of decision functions (but *not* of the sigma-algebra which remains unchanged) and for instance $\mathsf{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}$. To sum up, *a problem with incomplete information* is similar to a deterministic problem except that no point of its polytope is deterministic.

However, we have to ask whether a decision function f defined by seemingly deterministic equations might eventually lead to a strictly quantum situation. The answer is negative:

Lemma 2. *Given a feasible linear programming problem, if all specific equations are derived from classical Boolean equations, then the problem accepts a deterministic solution.*

Proof: Since the linear programming problem is feasible, the system accepts a solution and a probability distribution P is defined on $\mathcal{T}$. Specially, a probability distribution $\mathrm{P}(\xi|\mathsf{f})$ is defined on the sample set Ω. On the other hand, since f is a classical Boolean function, it is possible to check whether $\mathsf{f}(\xi)$ is TRUE or FALSE for all complete assignments $\xi \in \Omega$. If $\mathsf{f}(\xi) = \text{FALSE}$ for all ξ, then $\mathsf{f} = \varnothing$ and no probability distribution is defined on Ω: This contradicts the hypothesis that the problem is feasible. Therefore, the system accept a deterministic solution.

All preceding considerations are valid for any Boolean function. Now, we are going to describe an example of Bayesian process to compute the solutions of an explicit decision function. For the purpose in hand, we will solve the 3-SAT problem.

4 Polynomial time resolution of the 3-SAT problem

The 3-SAT problem is to determine whether a function f, defined as a conjunction of m disjunctions (or clauses) with exactly three literals, is or not satisfiable. For instance, a particular clause C_r may be

$$\mathsf{C}_r \overset{(\text{def})}{=} (\mathsf{X}_i, \overline{\mathsf{X}}_j, \mathsf{X}_k)$$

where $i, j, k \in [\![1, n]\!]$ are distinct, $r \in [\![1, m]\!]$ and of course $0 \leq m \leq 8\binom{n}{3}$, (recall that we note $(\mathsf{f}_1, \mathsf{f}_2)$ the *disjunction* of two decision functions f_1 and f_2). Therefore, we have by definition

$$\mathrm{P}(c_r|\mathsf{C}_r) = \mathrm{P}(c_r|\mathsf{f}) = 1$$

where (in this example) $c_r \overset{(\text{def})}{=} (i, -j, k)$. It is convenient to use rather the complement of c_r to obtain an equation in terms of partial probability,

$$\mathrm{P}(-i; j; -k|\mathsf{C}_r) = \mathrm{P}(-i; j; -k|\mathsf{f}) = 0, \tag{8}$$

(recall that we note $(i; j)$ the *conjunction* of two assignments i and j). In words, given that C_r is TRUE, then the probability of the complement of C_r to be TRUE is zero. *The 3-SAT problem is completely defined by m* specific equations *like Eq.(8).*

The consistency of the specific equations will be checked by reference to the relevant *universal equations.* Since the specific equations only involve requirements with three literals, requirements with more than three literals are irrelevant. Therefore, among the universal equations, only Eqs.(2-4) may be relevant. Now, the 3-SAT problem is described by the linear system Eqs.(2-4,8) in $\mathbb{R}$ of $\binom{n}{1}+4\binom{n}{2}+12\binom{n}{3}+m$ equations for $2\binom{n}{1}+4\binom{n}{2}+8\binom{n}{3}$ unknowns subject to the constraints

$$\mathrm{P}(\pm i|\mathsf{f}) \geq 0;\ \mathrm{P}(\pm i; \pm j|\mathsf{f}) \geq 0;\ \mathrm{P}(\pm i; \pm j; \pm k|\mathsf{f}) \geq 0 \tag{9}$$

where $i, j, k \in [\![1, n]\!]$ are distinct. This defines a classical problem of linear programming with $\mathrm{O}(n^3)$ unknowns.

In fact, the linear system can be strongly simplified. For instance, for zero clause, the system is reduced to the universal problem and a set of zero equation is quite sufficient! Generally, for non trivial problems the number of clauses is $m = \mathrm{O}(n)$ because otherwise the satisfiability is easy to determine. Whence, only a limited number of unknowns involving three or less literals are relevant, depending upon the particular problem. For example, the single clause defined by Eq.(8) involves 3×2 relevant unknowns with one literal, namely, $\mathrm{P}(\pm i|\mathsf{C}_r)$, $\mathrm{P}(\pm j|\mathsf{C}_r)$ and $\mathrm{P}(\pm k|\mathsf{C}_r)$, 3×4 relevant unknowns with two literals like $\mathrm{P}(\pm i; \pm j|\mathsf{C}_r))$ and 8 relevant unknowns with three literals, namely, $\mathrm{P}(\pm i; \pm j; \pm k|\mathsf{C}_r)$, i.e., a set of 26 unknowns per clause, and thus, when accounting for overlapping, a total of about $20m$ unknowns is relevant to the problem. When $m = \mathrm{O}(n)$, the number of *relevant unknowns* is rather $\mathrm{O}(n)$ than $\mathrm{O}(n^3)$.

Definition. *Given a 3-SAT problem, we will name* auxiliary Bayes system *the linear system defined by Eqs.(2-4,8) subject to constraints given by Eq. (9) and using only the relevant unknowns.*

If the 3-SAT problem is satisfiable, the linear programming problem accepts a deterministic separable solution and is ipso facto feasible.

Conversely suppose that the linear programming problem, Eqs. (1-4,8), is feasible. Since the specific equations are derived from Boolean relations, Lemma 2 holds and the system accepts a deterministic solution. From Lemma 1, this solution is separable. Therefore, we can compute $\mathrm{P}(i|\mathsf{f}) = 0$ or 1 for $|i| \in [\![1, n]\!]$ and $\mathrm{P}(\xi|\mathsf{f}) = 1$ for some $\xi \in \Omega$. It is possible that an unknown with one literal like $\mathrm{P}(\pm i|\mathsf{f})$ is not relevant, and thus the problem does not depend on this particular variable and the two partial assignments $(\pm i)$ are both valid. Eventually, the 3-SAT problem is satisfiable.

Theorem. *A 3-SAT problem is satisfiable if, and only if, its auxiliary Bayes system is feasible.*

Since the maximum value of m is $8\binom{n}{3} = \mathrm{O}(n^3)$, given that linear programming is in class P [25], the feasibility of the auxiliary Bayes system is obtained in polynomial time. Given finally that 3-SAT is NP- complete [27], we have the following result,

Corollary. *P=NP.*

Implementation The present Bayesian method stands basically as an enumeration of the relevant requirements. This appears rather disproportionate and even tedious for trivial issues. For example, with just a single clause and three variables, we have seen that we have 6 relevant unknowns with 1 literal, 12 unknowns with 2 literals and 8 unknowns with 3 literals, i.e., a total of 26 relevant unknowns. In addition, we have 1 specific equation like Eq.(8), 3 equations like Eq.(2), 12 equations like Eq.(3), and 12 equations like Eq.(4), i.e. a total of 28 equations for 26 unknowns, just to solve a trivial problem! But on the other hand, the number of relevant parameters (unknowns and equations) scales as $\mathrm{O}(m)$ with generally $m \ll \mathrm{O}(n^3)$, therefore the complexity remains polynomial for real problems and the method becomes very powerful compared to exponential algorithms.

When the problem is feasible, the initial step of the simplex method provides a feasible base but, in general, does not give a *deterministic solution.* Such a deterministic separable solution is obtained by optimazing a maximum of $2n$ objective functions. For example, we may first select the two objective functions $z_1 = \mathrm{P}(\pm 1|\mathsf{f})$. If the two maxima are both different from 1, then no deterministic solution is feasible which contradicts Lemma 2. Therefore, we have a maximum $z_1 = 1$ for say $z_1 = \mathrm{P}(-1|\mathsf{f})$. Now we might assign the value $\mathsf{X}_1 = \mathsf{FALSE}$ and the new problem with $n - 1$ variables would still be satisfiable. Instead, we select two objective functions $z_2 = \mathrm{P}(-1|\mathsf{f}) + \mathrm{P}(\pm 2|\mathsf{f})$. Now, if the two maxima are both different from 2, then again this contradicts Lemma 2. Therefore the maximum 2 is obtained e.g., for $z_2 = \mathrm{P}(-1|\mathsf{f}) + \mathrm{P}(2|\mathsf{f})$, we iterate with $z_3 = \mathrm{P}(-1|\mathsf{f}) + \mathrm{P}(2|\mathsf{f}) + \mathrm{P}(\pm 3|\mathsf{f})$, etc. Finally, we select an optimum solution with $\mathrm{P}(\pm i|\mathsf{f}) = 1$ for $i \in [\![1, n]\!]$.

Examples Let us give a few examples. In practice, using Eqs.(2-4), it is convenient to first eliminate partial probabilities with one or two literals and only deal with the relevant partial probabilities of three literals. This preliminary elimination will be done in the following examples. The first example, with a single clause, illustrates the fact that the method is basically an enumeration of the relevant partial probabilities. The seven vertices are deterministic while other solutions are entangled. The next case with two clauses illustrates how the universal equations Eqs.(3,4) behave like consistency conditions. The following example with 7 variables shows that an unsatisfiable problem leads to an unfeasible system, while the linear system without constraints has infinitely many solutions. The next case with 10 variables illustrates the fact that vertex feasible solutions are not in general separable and a linear optimization is necessary to obtain the deterministic solutions. The last problem with 87 variables is the only non trivial example and the first sample where the present method can compete with conventional methods.

One clause: For a single clause, only $n = 3$ variables are relevant. In this case, after elimination of unknowns of 1 and 2 literals, the system is reduced to an enumeration of the 8 partial probabilities of three literals. Let e.g., $\mathsf{f} \overset{\text{(def)}}{=} (\mathsf{X}_3, \mathsf{X}_2, \mathsf{X}_1)$. We have one normalization equation and one specific equation. For simplicity, we will omit throughout the conditional symbol, e.g. $\mathrm{P}(3;2;1)$ for $\mathrm{P}(3;2;1|\mathsf{f})$. The linear programming problem reads, in simplex formulation,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{P}(3;-2;-1) = 1 - \mathrm{P}(-3;2;-1) - \mathrm{P}(3;2;-1) - \mathrm{P}(-3;-2;1) \\ & \qquad\qquad - \mathrm{P}(3;-2;1) - \mathrm{P}(-3;2;1) - \mathrm{P}(3;2;1) \\ & \mathrm{P}(-3;-2;-1) = 0 \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \mathrm{P}(\pm1;\pm2;\pm3) \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

The system is feasible. This formulation displays one particular deterministic vertex solution: the two basic unknowns are $\mathrm{P}(3;-2;-1) = 1$ and $\mathrm{P}(-3;-2;-1) = 0$. Other unknowns are non basic and set to zero. The satisfying complete assignment ξ is obtained using Eq.(7) and Eq.(2), i.e., for the displayed vertex, $\xi = (3;-2;-1)$. The 6 other vertex solutions are also deterministic and obtained by straightforward pivoting from this configuration.

Two clauses: Let $n = 4$ variables and e.g., $\mathsf{f} \overset{\text{(def)}}{=} [(\mathsf{X}_3, \overline{\mathsf{X}}_2, \mathsf{X}_1); (\overline{\mathsf{X}}_4, \mathsf{X}_3, \mathsf{X}_2)]$. The full problem has 44 unknowns and 50 equations. After elimination of the partial probabilities with less than 3 literals, we have 16 relevant unknowns and 12 equations,

2 universal normalization equations, derived from Eq.(2) namely

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{P}(-3;-2;-1) + \mathrm{P}(3;-2;-1) + \mathrm{P}(-3;2;-1) + \mathrm{P}(3;2;-1) + \\ & \qquad \mathrm{P}(-3;-2;1) + \mathrm{P}(3;-2;1) + \mathrm{P}(-3;2;1) + \mathrm{P}(3;2;1) = 1 \\ & \mathrm{P}(-4;-3;-2) + \mathrm{P}(4;-3;-2) + \mathrm{P}(-4;3;-2) + \mathrm{P}(4;3;-2) + \\ & \qquad \mathrm{P}(-4;-3;2) + \mathrm{P}(4;-3;2) + \mathrm{P}(-4;3;2) + \mathrm{P}(4;3;2) = 1 \end{aligned}$$

4 universal consistency equations, derived from Eq.(3) namely

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{P}(-3;-2;-1) + \mathrm{P}(3;-2;-1) + \mathrm{P}(-3;-2;1) + \mathrm{P}(3;-2;1) \\ & \qquad = \mathrm{P}(-4;-3;-2) + \mathrm{P}(4;-3;-2) + \mathrm{P}(-4;3;-2) + \mathrm{P}(4;3;-2) \\ & \mathrm{P}(-3;2;-1) + \mathrm{P}(3;2;-1) + \mathrm{P}(-3;2;1) + \mathrm{P}(3;2;1) \\ & \qquad = \mathrm{P}(-4;-3;2) + \mathrm{P}(4;-3;2) + \mathrm{P}(-4;3;2) + \mathrm{P}(4;3;2) \\ & \mathrm{P}(-3;-2;-1) + \mathrm{P}(-3;2;-1) + \mathrm{P}(-3;-2;1) + \mathrm{P}(-3;2;1) \\ & \qquad = \mathrm{P}(-4;-3;-2) + \mathrm{P}(4;-3;-2) + \mathrm{P}(-4;-3;2) + \mathrm{P}(4;-3;2) \\ & \mathrm{P}(3;-2;-1) + \mathrm{P}(3;2;-1) + \mathrm{P}(3;-2;1) + \mathrm{P}(3;2;1) \\ & \qquad = \mathrm{P}(-4;3;-2) + \mathrm{P}(4;3;-2) + \mathrm{P}(-4;3;2) + \mathrm{P}(4;3;2) \end{aligned}$$

4 universal consistency equations, derived from Eq.(4) namely

$$\begin{aligned}
&P(-3;-2;-1)+P(-3;-2;1)=P(-4;-3;-2)+P(4;-3;-2)\\
&P(-3;2;-1)+P(-3;2;1)=P(-4;-3;2)+P(4;-3;2)\\
&P(3;-2;-1)+P(3;-2;1)=P(-4;3;-2)+P(4;3;-2)\\
&P(3;2;-1)+P(3;2;1)=P(-4;3;2)+P(4;3;2)
\end{aligned}$$

and 2 specific equations, namely

$$\begin{aligned}
&P(-3;2;-1)=0\\
&P(4;-3;-2)=0
\end{aligned}$$

The rank of the system is 7 and the linear programming problem reads, in simplex formulation,

$$\begin{aligned}
P(-3;-2;-1) &= 1-P(-3;-2;1)-P(-4;3;-2)-P(4;3;-2)\\
&\qquad -P(-4;-3;2)-P(4;-3;2)-P(-4;3;2)-P(4;3;2)\\
P(-4;-3;-2) &= 1-P(-4;3;-2)-P(4;3;-2)-P(-4;-3;2)\\
&\qquad -P(4;-3;2)-P(-4;3;2)-P(4;3;2)\\
P(3;2;-1) &= 0-P(3;2;1)+P(-4;3;2)+P(4;3;2)\\
P(3;-2;1) &= 0-P(3;-2;-1)+P(-4;3;-2)+P(4;3;-2)\\
P(-3;2;1) &= 0+P(-4;-3;2)+P(4;-3;2)\\
P(-3;2;-1) &= 0\\
P(4;-3;-2) &= 0
\end{aligned}$$

We set to zero the non-basic unknowns: The only non zero partial probabilities are $P(-3;-2;-1)=1$ and $P(-4;-3;-2)=1$ leading to the satisfying complete assignment $\xi=(-4;-3;-2;-1)$, obtained from Eqs.(7, 2) for the displayed vertex. Other solutions are obtained by pivoting.

Example of non satisfiable problem, 27 *clauses,* $n=7$:

Let $f \overset{\text{(def)}}{=} [(\overline{X}_3,X_2,\overline{X}_1);\ (\overline{X}_3,X_2,X_1);\ (X_3,X_2,\overline{X}_1);\ (\overline{X}_4,\overline{X}_3,\overline{X}_2);\ (X_4,X_2,X_1);\ (\overline{X}_5,\overline{X}_2,\overline{X}_1);$ $(\overline{X}_5,\overline{X}_4,\overline{X}_2);\ (\overline{X}_5,\overline{X}_4,X_3);\ (X_5,\overline{X}_3,X_2);\ (X_5,\overline{X}_4,\overline{X}_3);\ (X_5,X_4,\overline{X}_3);\ (\overline{X}_6,\overline{X}_4,\overline{X}_1);\ (\overline{X}_6,\overline{X}_5,\overline{X}_4);$ $(\overline{X}_6,X_5,\overline{X}_2);\ (\overline{X}_6,X_5,\overline{X}_3);\ (X_6,\overline{X}_5,\overline{X}_1);\ (X_6,X_5,\overline{X}_1);\ (X_6,X_5,\overline{X}_2);\ (\overline{X}_7,\overline{X}_2,X_1);\ (\overline{X}_7,\overline{X}_3,\overline{X}_2);$ $(\overline{X}_7,\overline{X}_4,X_1);\ (\overline{X}_7,X_4,\overline{X}_2);\ (\overline{X}_7,X_5,\overline{X}_3);\ (X_7,X_3,X_2);\ (X_7,X_4,\overline{X}_3);\ (X_7,\overline{X}_5,X_4);\ (X_7,X_6,\overline{X}_4)]$

We have 160 relevant 3-literal unknowns, 20 normalization equations, $126+156$ consistency equations and 27 specific equations, i.e., a total of 309 equations. The rank of the linear system is 139. When accounted for the constraints the linear programming problem is not feasible. Therefore, the 3-SAT system is not satisfiable.

Example of satisfiable problem, 39 *clauses,* $n=10$:

Let $f \overset{\text{(def)}}{=} [(\overline{X}_4,\overline{X}_3,X_2);\ (X_4,\overline{X}_3,\overline{X}_1);\ (\overline{X}_5,\overline{X}_2,\overline{X}_1);\ (\overline{X}_5,X_2,\overline{X}_1);\ (\overline{X}_5,\overline{X}_3,\overline{X}_2);\ (\overline{X}_5,\overline{X}_4,X_2);$ $(X_5,X_4,\overline{X}_2);\ (X_6,X_3,X_1);\ (X_6,X_5,X_3);\ (X_6,X_5,X_4);\ (\overline{X}_7,X_5,X_2);\ (\overline{X}_7,X_6,\overline{X}_4);\ (\overline{X}_8,\overline{X}_3,\overline{X}_2);$ $(\overline{X}_8,\overline{X}_3,X_2);\ (\overline{X}_8,\overline{X}_4,X_3);\ (\overline{X}_8,\overline{X}_5,\overline{X}_4);\ (\overline{X}_8,X_5,\overline{X}_1);\ (\overline{X}_8,X_6,X_1);\ (\overline{X}_8,X_6,X_2);\ (X_8,X_4,X_1);$ $(X_8,\overline{X}_7,X_1);\ (X_8,\overline{X}_7,X_3);\ (\overline{X}_9,X_5,\overline{X}_4);\ (\overline{X}_9,X_6,X_4);\ (\overline{X}_9,\overline{X}_7,X_6);\ (\overline{X}_9,X_7,X_4);\ (\overline{X}_9,X_7,X_5);$ $(\overline{X}_9,X_8,\overline{X}_2);\ (X_9,X_3,\overline{X}_1);\ (X_9,\overline{X}_6,X_1);\ (X_9,\overline{X}_8,X_5);\ (\overline{X}_{10},\overline{X}_2,X_1);\ (\overline{X}_{10},X_3,X_2);\ (\overline{X}_{10},\overline{X}_6,\overline{X}_3);$ $(X_{10},\overline{X}_7,X_1);\ (X_{10},\overline{X}_7,X_5);\ (X_{10},X_8,\overline{X}_5);\ (X_{10},X_8,X_5);\ (X_{10},X_9,\overline{X}_5)]$

We have 35 normalization equations, $190+244$ consistency equations and 39 specific equations, i.e., a total 469 equations for 280 relevant 3-literal unknowns. The rank of the linear system is 230. The linear programming problem is feasible and accepts a single deterministic solution. In our particular implementation, we find first a highly entangled basic solution. Therefore, we have to use a maximization process to compute the deterministic solution.

Example of 232 *clause problem with* $n = 87$: This is the last and only non trivial example, obtained from the competition *SAT 2007 Conference on Satisfiability testing* and referred to as 'a permuted 3-SAT formula with seed=1442724072'. The particular 'permuted' structure leads to a surprisingly simple linear system with only 464 relevant 3-literal unknowns for 464 equations, namely, 58 normalization equations, 174+0 consistency equations and 232 specific equations. The rank is 377 and the problem is feasible.

We have computed the preceding instances with home-made codes in an old fashion language just to corroborate the principle. To obtain challenging results, we need to run an efficient linear programming package for sparse systems. Clearly, the scaling efficiency of the method depends solely upon this package.

5 Conclusion

Taking advantage of the close proximity between logic and Bayesian probability, we have shown that a particular NP-complete problem, namely 3-SAT, can be efficiently solved by linear programming, i.e., in polynomial time. Therefore, a long-standing problem of algorithmic complexity is settled and P=NP. This result is of course of outstanding importance in both practical and theoretical domains.

Practically, the consequences are dramatic: No one-way function can exist and thus no public-key encryption system can be safe. It is urgently needed to revisit all current systems. This includes internet communication, smart cards, banking operations, digital signature, etc. Only symmetrical encryption with one-time pad may be safe but key transportation has to be defended from eavesdropping.

Theoretically, the consequences are in no way less important. The P versus NP problem is one of the seven Millennium Prize Problems of the Clay Mathematics Institute (CMI) [34]. According to Cook [27] the present result should have 'stunning consequences and may well include all of the CMI prize problems'...

In line with the present paper, we will just comment two issues. First, we have brought into play a new method of computation at an elementary level with a result surprisingly powerful. To put it in a nutshell, this method is basically an enumeration of the relevant partial probabilities subject to specific conditions. The consistency of these inputs is checked by linear programming with reference to universal probability laws, i.e., to Boolean logic. In NP-problems, the overall input size is bounded by a polynomial in the number of variables. Given that linear programming is of class P, the consistency is checked in polynomial time. The formal difference with usual algorithms is that we deal with partial probabilities that are set down as the very unknowns of the problem. In a way, this may be compared to the introduction of an unknown 'x' to address 'arithmetic problem' in elementary curriculum, leading to a different conception landscape. We propose a similar paradigm to address Boolean problems. This should open up a promising domain beside conventional deterministic and probabilistic algorithms, utilizing the complete tool kit of both Bayesian [15] and information [30] theories. Eventually, this also suggests a close connection between algorithmic complexity and Kolmogorov complexity.

The second issue concerns quantum information. In fact, we started this work for understanding the exponential speed-up of quantum computation, given that we regard entanglement as a strictly classical attribute of contextual systems [14]. Therefore, we suspected that entanglement was not the real booster, except if P=NP. Even highly improbable, this second hypothesis turns out to be right. Actually, in Bayesian formulation, a form of entanglement is at work in both classical and quantum computation, while the use of strictly quantum description does not seem to provide any decisive benefit. This gives new insights on the possible foundations of quantum theory, supporting the Bayesian approach proposed by Caves et al [33] and suggests that quantum mechanical structure could be basically a powerful mathematical tool describing something like an 'algebra of logical observables'.

References

[1] Leonid Levin, Home page.
URL `http://www.cs.bu.edu/~lnd/`

[2] A. Church, An unsolvable problem of elementary number theory, American Journal of Mathematics 58 (1) (1936) 345–353.

[3] A. Turing, On computable numbers, with an application to the *Entscheidungsproblem*, Proc. of the London Mathematical Society 42 (1936) 230–265.

[4] M. O. Rabin, D. Scott, Finite automata and their decision problems, IBM Journal of Research and Development 3 (2) (1959) 114.

[5] E. R. Berlekamp, Factoring polynomials over large finite fields, Math. Comp. 24 (1970) 713–735.

[6] R. Solovay, V. Strassen, A fast Monte-Carlo test for primality, SIAM J. Comput. 6 (1) (1977) 84–85.

[7] R. Feynman, Simulating physics with computers, International Journal of Theoretical Physics 21 (6/7) (1982) 467–488.

[8] D. Deutsch, Quantum theory, the Church-Turing principle and the universal quantum computer, Proc. R. Soc., London A 400 (1985) 97–117.

[9] T. D. Ladd, F. Jelezko, R. Laflamme, Y. Nakamura, C. Monroe, J. L. O'Brien, Quantum computers, Nature 464 (2010) 45–53. `arXiv:1009.2267`.

[10] J. Watrous, An introduction to quantum information and quantum circuits, ACM SIGACT News 42 (2) (2011) 52–67.
URL `http://www.cs.uwaterloo.ca/~watrous/papers.html`

[11] E. Bernstein, U. Vazirani, Quantum complexity theory, in: STOC '93: Proceedings of the twenty-fifth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing, ACM, New York, NY, USA, 1993, pp. 11–20.

[12] P. W. Shor, Polynomial-time algorithms for prime factorization and discrete logarithms on a quantum computer, SIAM J.Sci.Statist.Comput. 26 (1997) 1484. `arXiv:quant-ph/9508027`.

[13] J. Preskill, Quantum computing and the entanglement frontier (Mar. 2012). `arXiv:1203.5813`.

[14] M. Feldmann, Classical description of quantum randomness using stochastic gauge systems (2009). `arXiv:0911.1525[quant-ph]`.

[15] E. T. Jaynes, Probability Theory: The Logic of Science, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2003.

[16] G. Pólya, Les mathématiques et le raisonnement plausible, Gauthier-Villard, Gabay, Paris, 1958.

[17] R. T. Cox, Probability, frequency, and reasonable expectation, American Journal of Physics 14 (1946) 1–13.

[18] C. E. Shannon, A mathematical theory of communication, Bell System Technical Journal 27 (1948) 379–423 , 656–715.

[19] H. J. von Neumann, A certain zero-sum two-person game equivalent to the optimal assignment problem, in: H. W. Kuhn, A. W. Tucker (Eds.), Contributions to the Theory of Games, vol. II, Ann. of Math. Studies, no. 28, Princeton, 1953, pp. 5–12.

[20] M. O. Rabin, Degree of difficulty of computing a function and a partial ordering of recursive sets, Tech. rep., O.N.R. No 1 Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel (1960).

[21] A. Cobham, The intrinsic computational difficulty of functions, in: Proc. Logic, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science II, North Holland, 1965, pp. 24–30.

[22] J. Hartmanis, R. E. Stearns, On the computational complexity of algorithms, Trans. AMS 117 (1965) 285–306.

[23] M. Blum, A machine-independent theory of the complexity of recursive functions, J. ACM 14 (2) (1967) 322–336.

[24] S. Cook, The P versus NP problem (2000).
URL `http://www.claymath.org/millennium/P_vs_NP/pvsnp.pdf`

[25] L. Khachiyan, A polynomial time algorithm for linear programming, Doklady Akod. Nouk SSSR 244 (5) (1979) 1093–1096.

[26] G. B. Dantzig, Maximization of a linear function of variables subject to linear inequalities, in: T. Koopmans (Ed.), Activity Analysis of Production and Allocation, Wiley & Chapman-Hall, New York, London, 1951, pp. 339–347.

[27] S. Cook, The complexity of theorem proving procedures, in: Proceedings of the Third Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, ACM, New York, NY, USA, 1971, pp. 151–158.

[28] L. A. Levin, Universal search problems, Peredaci lnformocii 9 (1973) 115–116.
URL `http://www.cs.bu.edu/fac/lnd/research/publ.htm#dan73b`

[29] R. M. Karp, Reducibility among combinatorial problems, in: R. E. Miller, J. W. Thatcher (Eds.), Complexity of Computer Computations, The IBM Research Symposia Series, Plenum Press, New York, NY, USA, 1972.

[30] R. W. Yeung, Information Theory and network coding, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2008.

[31] T. H. Cormen, C. E. Leiserton, R. L. Rivest, C. Stein, Introduction to Algorithms, MIT Press, Cambridge,Ma., USA, 2009.

[32] K. G. Murty, Linear Programming, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1983.

[33] C. M. Caves, C. A. Fuchs, R. Schack, Quantum probabilities as Bayesian probabilities, Phys. Rev. A 65 (2) (2002) 22305. `arXiv:quant-ph/0106133`.

[34] Clay Mathematics Institute. [link].
URL `http://www.claymath.org/millennium/`